SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL SERVICES CONTRACT
RFP NNS09ZDA007R
February 23, 2010

On January 28, 2010 I, along with selected ex-officio members at the John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for the Information and Technical Services (ITS) Contract. During this meeting, the SEB presented the initial findings resulting from the evaluation process. I discussed the relative merits of each proposal with the SEB members, as well as with the other attendees, to assure I had a full understanding of the SEB's evaluation.

This document summarizes this procurement, the evaluation process, the results of that process, and the basis of my selection of an offeror for award.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The ITS Contract provides a broad range of services in support of the respective missions of NASA and over thirty resident agencies sharing and utilizing facilities and services at SSC. The purpose of this procurement is to provide for a follow-on acquisition to the current Information Technology Services Contract. The successful offeror will be required to provide Information and Technical Services (ITS) to NASA, resident agencies, on-site contractors, and on-site commercial tenants. Services to be provided under this contract include: project management; information and technical support services; technology support services; applied science and technology services; and other future requirements (telecommunications services).

This acquisition is 100% Small Business Set-Aside. These services will be provided under a performance-based Cost-Plus-Incentive Fee (CPIF) contract. The initial period of performance is two (2) years with three (3) one-year priced option periods for a maximum period of five (5) years. The option periods were evaluated and considered by the Source Selection Authority as part of the competition.

PROCUREMENT HISTORY

On March 2, 2009 I appointed members to the SEB for the purpose of evaluating proposals received in response to the solicitation. The SEB included representatives from the Office of External Affairs, Office of Safety and Mission Assurance, Engineering and Test Directorate, Center Operations Directorate and the Office of Procurement. To aid in the evaluation, I also appointed technical evaluators with expertise in the appropriate disciplines to provide supplemental assessments of proposal strengths and weaknesses.

Prior to the issuance of the final Request for Proposals (RFP), in an effort to better inform industry of NASA requirements, the SEB released a draft RFP on July 2, 2009. A site visit was conducted on July 16, 2009 and included a briefing and windshield tour of the site. Forty-two prospective firms attended the site visit. The Santa Rosa conference room was available following the site visit to allow large and small businesses an opportunity to meet and discuss possible partnering

relationships. Responses and comments to the draft RFP were welcomed, carefully evaluated and incorporated into the RFP, as appropriate. The SEB prepared a response to each comment received and released the responses to industry on August 10, 2009. The responses to vendor questions, as well as an electronic library providing technical information, were made available through the internet for the benefit of all interested offerors.

The final ITS RFP was released on August 7, 2009 via the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps), providing all interested offerors the ability to download the documents. Two (2) amendments containing administrative or minor changes to the RFP in response to interested offerors' questions were also posted to the NAIS and FedBizOpps: Amendment No. 1 on August 20, 2009 addressed vendor questions; Amendment No. 2 on August 26, 2009 addressed additional vendor questions.

In total, the SEB received eight (8) proposals in response to the RFP. Past Performance Volumes were received on September 1, 2009 and Mission Suitability and Cost Volumes were received on September 9, 2009 from the following offerors:

Anadarko Industries, LLC
17625 El Camino Real, Suite 410
Houston, TX 77058-3052

ASRC Research and Technology Solutions, LLC
6303 Ivy Lane, Suite 130
Greenbelt, MD 20770

Geocent American Operations, LLC
111 Veterans Memorial Blvd, Suite 1600
Metairie, LA 70005

Information Management Resources, Inc.
23332 Mill Creek Dr., Suite 235
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Methods Technology Solutions, Inc.
4734 Jamestown Ave.
Baton Rouge, LA 70808

NVision Solutions, Inc.
13131 SR Highway 603
Bldg. # 1, Suite 301
Stennis Technology Park
Bay St Louis, MS 39520

REDE/Critique Joint Venture
5700 Bullard Ave., Suite 300
New Orleans, LA 70128

SaiTech, Inc
5101 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Suite 307
Washington, DC 20016

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation and the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815.3, "Source Selection." Additionally, the SEB developed a detailed Evaluation Plan which was followed throughout the evaluation process.

The solicitation provided for selection and award in accordance with FAR 15.101-1, "Tradeoff process." However, use of tradeoffs was not necessary.

The RFP prescribed three (3) evaluation factors considered essential in an offer: Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Cost. The Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors, when combined, were significantly more important than the Cost factor. As individual factors, the three (3) factors were essentially equal in importance.

The three (3) evaluation factors were described in the RFP as follows:

Mission Suitability: The proposals were analyzed for the excellence of the proposed work and the offeror's ability to perform that work, including the offeror's understanding of the requirements and the proposed technical, management, and safety and health approaches to meeting the requirements. The Mission Suitability factor consisted of three (3) subfactors and each subfactor in each proposal received an adjectival rating and a numerical score, in accordance with the RFP:

A. Technical Performance	550 points
B. Management	400 points
C. Safety and Health	50 points

Overall, each offeror could receive a total of 1,000 points and a commensurate adjectival rating for the Mission Suitability Factor as a whole. The applicable adjectival ratings were "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair" and "Poor." The definitions for the adjectival ratings and percentile ranges can be found in NFS 1815.305(a)(3).

Past Performance: Past Performance was also evaluated, but not numerically scored. Instead, the SEB assigned a level of confidence rating of either "Very High Level of Confidence," "High Level of Confidence," "Moderate Level of Confidence," "Low Level of Confidence," "Very Low Level of Confidence," or "Neutral." These level of confidence ratings can be found in NFS 1815.305(a)(2).

In accordance with the RFP, the SEB evaluated relevant information regarding the offeror's performance under previously-awarded contracts similar to the size and complexity of this procurement. Using information provided directly by the offeror, information from questionnaires submitted to the SEB by the offeror's past customers and independently-obtained information from Government and non-Government sources, the SEB evaluated the degree to which the offeror satisfied the requirements of previous contracts. In addition to other relevant Past Performance information requested in the RFP, consideration was given to characteristics such as resiliency, resourcefulness, safety record, environmental record and management determination to see that the offeror lived up to its commitments to provide specific standards and skills.

Cost: The Cost evaluation considered all costs associated with the contract in terms of validity, reasonableness, adequacy and cost realism of proposed costs. Proposed costs were analyzed to determine the probable cost for the initial two (2)-year base period, as well as all option periods and to identify and weigh features that would cause a given proposal to cost more or less than the others, including proposal risk areas. The Cost factor was not adjectivally or numerically scored, but was evaluated to determine if the proposed costs were realistic for the work to be performed, whether the costs reflected an understanding of the work requirements, and if the costs were consistent with the various elements of the Mission Suitability proposal.

As stated in the RFP and in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award a contract based on the initial offers received without conducting discussions with the offerors. Discussions would be held only if award on the basis of initial offers was determined not to be in the Government's best interest. Therefore, offerors were encouraged to submit initial proposals containing their best terms from a cost and technical standpoint.

SELECTION DECISION

Immediately following the SEB presentation on January 28, 2010, I met in executive session with key senior advisors familiar with the RFP, who had attended the SEB presentation. These ex-officio members included representatives from the Office of Chief Counsel, Office of Procurement, Engineering and Test Directorate, and Center Operations Directorate. Because of the far-reaching responsibilities of the future ITS contractor and the role the ITS contract plays in their respective programs, I solicited and considered the views of these officials in reaching my independent decision.

With respect to the process and findings, I probed the SEB during the presentation and considered its evaluation of the proposals against the prescribed evaluation criteria contained in the RFP. I concluded the evaluation plan was followed and the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough and well-documented. As the Source Selection Authority, I concurred with the findings of the SEB and adopted those findings without exception. I made my selection decision based on a comparative assessment of the proposals against all source selection criteria stated in the RFP. I did not simply count and compare the numbers of strengths and weaknesses, but considered the potential impact of a strength or weakness by considering the relevance of each to this proposed effort.

During the presentation, the senior advisors and I thoroughly questioned the SEB on a number of the findings and were satisfied with the responses provided by the team. I hereby conclude it is in the Government's best interest to award on initial offers and select ASRC Research and Technology Solutions, LLC (ARTS) to receive this contract award. In making the decision to award on initial offers, I determined the remaining offerors did not have a reasonable chance of being selected for award based on the evaluation factors stated in the solicitation. Additional reasoning for my decision is explained below.

The solicitation prescribes that all three (3) evaluation factors are essentially equal in importance. In Mission Suitability, ARTS' numerical score was markedly higher than that of the other offerors. In Past Performance, the offerors received level of confidence ratings ranging from "Moderate" to "Very High." ARTS and Anadarko were the only offerors to receive the highest rating possible for this factor. Under the Cost factor, ARTS had the lowest proposed and probable cost. An analysis at this level reveals that the ARTS proposal offers an advantage to NASA in each of the three (3) factors, but I continued my review to provide an in-depth study of the findings.

Under the Technical Performance subfactor, ARTS received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and was the only offeror to receive the highest rating available for this subfactor. Most notably, ARTS exhibited a comprehensive understanding and logical approach to accomplishing the requirements of numerous distinct areas of the PWS where knowledge of processes and innovative solutions are critical and of substantial value to the contract. While most of the offerors demonstrated an understanding of the requirements in a limited number of the PWS sections, ARTS provided a thorough approach to meeting the requirements in multiple areas of the PWS. ARTS's extensive capability increased my confidence in the probable success of the contract. Additionally, the proposed approach to increasing efficiency, improving customer communications and uncovering potential risks included the application of specific tools and methodologies which I believe would

ultimately manifest in time and cost savings. In particular, ARTS proposed a multi-faceted approach to improving customer communications through personal interaction and the use of web-based tools. I believe this combination of customer service initiatives, as well as, the application of new tools and methodologies would ultimately improve productivity and customer satisfaction at SSC. ARTS also detailed a plan for enhancing the existing reporting capability of the Government's Configuration Control Tracking System (CCTS) which would allow for the sharing of information, as well as, increased productivity and efficiency.

In the Management subfactor, ARTS received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" which exceeded the adjectival score of any other offeror for this subfactor. ARTS's overall management approach to controlling and managing the services in the PWS was most noteworthy. In particular, ARTS proposed the implementation of three (3) overarching management processes that would result in additional cost savings to the Government while accomplishing contract requirements in a timely and efficient manner. While other offerors were also recognized for their proposed approaches to processing metrics, ARTS's approach to metrics exceeded expectations in its combined use of tools and its ability to provide a more complete representation of contract performance.

In the Safety and Health subfactor, ARTS was the only offeror to receive an adjectival rating of "Excellent." ARTS's proposal provided a credible, accelerated schedule for obtaining Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) Star Certification. Because SSC is diligently pursuing VPP Star Certification site-wide, a shortened schedule for the ITS contract would allow SSC to meet its overall goals in a more timely fashion. Additionally, ARTS proposed a subcontractor with experience in VPP certification and with an exemplary safety record based on incentivizing employees to identify workplace hazards. As NASA strives to improve safety and health in the workplace at SSC, the well-structured safety plan detailed in ARTS's proposal increased my confidence in its ability to create and maintain a safe working environment.

Overall, I noted that ARTS had submitted a well-balanced proposal for the Mission Suitability factor with Significant Strengths and broad-based strengths in each subfactor. A comparison of the offerors under this factor revealed that ARTS received a higher adjectival score in all subfactors and the other offerors did not offer the same level of qualitative benefit. In weighing the relative value and risks to the Government, I believe ARTS to have a marked advantage over the other offerors in the Mission Suitability factor.

In the Past Performance factor, I noted that two (2) offerors received a level of confidence rating of "Very High." The past performance information submitted by ARTS and gathered by the SEB evidenced extensive experience highly-relevant to this contract, in addition to excellent award fee scores and positive comments from previous customers. Specifically, previous customers highlighted ARTS's ability to perform complex engineering tasks while maintaining a high level of customer confidence and satisfaction. I considered the demonstrated ability to balance technical skill with strong management and customer satisfaction to be a benefit to the successful accomplishment of requirements on the ITS contract. After a comparative assessment of all the findings under Past Performance, I concluded that ARTS provided the highest level of confidence in its demonstrated ability to provide future contract success.

Finally, I took into consideration the Cost factor. All offerors received either an upwards or downwards adjustment to their cost proposals. ARTS' proposed cost was adjusted upwards to account for minor errors in staffing, but had the lowest proposed, as well as probable, cost even after the adjustment was performed. I felt confident that ARTS's proposed cost was reasonable for the proposed effort.

In summary, ARTS displayed a clear advantage in Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Cost.

Based on my considerations outlined above, I conclude that ARTS' offer, in my judgment, is clearly the most advantageous to the Government. The superior Mission Suitability rating and excellent Past Performance, coupled with its lower probable cost, amply demonstrate ARTS' ability to successfully complete the contract requirements while providing the overall best value to the Government. Accordingly, I select ASRC Research and Technology Solutions, LLC for award of the Information and Technical Services Contract at the John C. Stennis Space Center.

Patrick E. Scheuermann
Source Selection Authority